

You ought get our
Club Rates.
It will pay you.

KANSAS AGITATOR.

By getting our
Club Rates,
You'll save money.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF NATURAL MONOPOLIES

VOL. 10.

GARNETT, KANSAS, APRIL 27, 1900.

NO. 49.

KANSAS AGITATOR

Devoted to the interests of
THE MASSES.

A Fearless, Aggressive, Progressive Advocate of
All Reforms.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

OFFICIAL PAPER OF ANDERSON COUNTY.

W. O. CHAMBERLAIN and ANNA CHAMPE Editors.

J. M. ALEXANDER, Associate Editor.

SUBSCRIPTION: 8-PAGE EDITION, \$1; 4-PAGE Ed., 50c.

N. R. P. A. † K. R. P. A.

Entered as second-class mail matter at the Garnett, Kans., postoffice
May 25, 1899.

GARNETT, KANSAS, APRIL 27, 1900.

THE CLARK LOCAL OPTION BILL.

Anti-Liquor Legislation Defeated to Save the Republican Party.

J. Knox Montgomery, in a communication to the Midland, one of the organs of the United Presbyterian church, lays bare the cowardly attitude of the Republican party on the liquor question. We republish the letter:

It has gone "the way of all the earth;" or, to put it more explicitly, it has gone the way of all local option bills presented to the Ohio legislature during the past six years. It went to its long home the same road traveled by the Haskell and Harris bill of former years—passed the lower house with ease, but was defeated by one vote, and that, in this instance, the vote of Senator Vilhelm, of Canton, the home of the president. The bill was an anti-saloon league—"omni-partisan"—measure and provided for a local option vote in municipalities and wards of municipalities upon petition of twenty-five per cent. of the qualified voters in the district affected.

The bill passed the lower house February 7th, and was promptly messaged over to the senate; but Lieutenant-Governor Caldwell (a renegade United Presbyterian, by the way,) "did not let the bill go to the senate, but deliberately held it up to give the liquor men time to do their

work"—so said the Columbus and Cincinnati dailies of February 8th. These papers further gave as news from the capital, February 8th: "To-day, Lieutenant-Governor Caldwell closed himself in his room at the Neil House with Colonel Carl Hostetter, of Columbus, a member of the member of the governor's staff president of the state brewers' association; W. W. D. Chapman, of Cleveland, secretary of the same association, and Tim McDonough, of Cleveland, president of the state liquor dealers' association. In order to get time for this conference the afternoon session of the senate was adjourned. The conference discussed the best method to secure the defeat of the Clark bill." "Many of the Republican members hold to the opinion that the party will lose many thousands of votes in the next election if the bill becomes a law, and this sentiment will be used as an argument to turn the majority against the proposition." Further the press of February 9th said: "According to the statement made by Hon. Thos. R. Clark, of Franklin county, author of the bill, Governor Nash himself has taken an active hand in the fight against the bill. Clark stated to a fellow member that the governor sent for him and declared that the passage of the bill would mean a loss of 50,000 votes to the Republican party at the next state election. He reprimanded the young legislator for introducing such a measure. Mr. Clark also states, and his statement is borne out by others, that the governor to-day sent for members of the general assembly and asked them to vote against the bill. He based this request upon the desire for future Republican success. Others who are interested in the defeat of the Clark bill give a different reason for the governor's interest in this bit of legislation. According to their statements, the state liquor league absolutely depeuded upon the state administration defeating the Clark bill, or any other bill which might be presented of a similar character. The brewers' association alone contributed \$50,000 to the Republican campaign fund, and its members naturally expected some results beyond a Colonel's sword for their president."

All this is ancient history, I know, being the record of February 8th, but it is recorded here because many of the readers of the Midland did not see the Columbus and Cincinnati papers of February 9th, and also to present the fact that Governor Nash and our friend, Lieutenant-Governor Caldwell succeeded in giving the liquor interests the time they desired and needed for the defeat of the bill, since it was not voted on in the senate until March 14th, a month and a week after it passed the lower house.

After its defeat in the senate, the Columbus Citizen said: "This point cannot be disputed, the bill was defeated at the request of Governor Nash and the national administration, as represented by Charles Dick and Mark Hanna. Dick's friend and neighbor, Mr. Sieber, managed the fight and applied the administration pressure. John R. Malloy, the spokesman of Governor Nash, was also active, as was Charley Pryor, Senator Foraker's law partner. Direct requests were made to certain men by both Foraker and Hanna to vote against the bill for party reasons."

Rev. Mr. Baker, superintendent of the Ohio anti-saloon league, a Republican, says: "When the Harris local option bill was before the general assembly four years ago, the cry was

OUR Spring and Summer Offerings For 1900



To those in search of the best of everything at the lowest prices. Many styles, embracing THE LATEST FADS AND FABRICS. Our stock is large, and as complete as we ever can make it. We have given special care to the selection of BOYS' and CHILDREN'S NEEDS, as well as MEN'S, and have just the things that a mother likes to have her boy wear. You will find the Fashionable things here as soon as they are out. Come and see us when you want SHIRTS, HOSIERY, NECKWEAR, UNDERWEAR, HATS, CAPS, FINE SHOES, etc.



LESCH CLOTHING COMPANY

Corner—Kirk Block—South Side.

raised that it must not pass, as it would endanger the chances of the party and Mr. McKinley's election to the presidency. The Republican legislature which elected M. A. Hanna senator two years ago, not only refused to give advanced temperance legislation, but repealed two of our most prominent temperance laws. George K. Nash was elected governor, (by the help of Mr. Baker and the anti-saloon league) and his first official act was to appoint upon his staff the leading distiller and the leading brewer of the state; and that brewer president of the brewers' association. For lieutenant-governor, the party nominated the attorney of the brewers, Caldwell, who in the most offensive manner lobbied against the Clark bill. This bill was defeated to-day by a strongly Republican legislature on the ground that it would hurt the party and might interfere with the re-election of Senator Foraker. This is a declaration of certain so-called party leaders, that the saloons of Ohio are more worthy of consideration than the 250,000 church voters."

The liquor interests openly defied the Republican legislature to pass this mild, "very mild" (Superintendent Baker calls it) local option bill, declaring that they would defeat McKinley and Foraker if it became a law. The political parties have long since learned that when the liquor men say a thing they mean it; hence the defeat of the bill by one vote.

Now "what is all this worth?" This question I cannot answer, but will say that these facts are recited here for the purpose of asking this question, what are the United Presbyterian voters of Ohio going to do about it when they get a chance to do something this fall? It does seem that something ought to be done in the great state of Ohio to convince the leaders of the Republican party that there are several thousand church members in that commonwealth whose opinions on the liquor question are worthy of as much consideration, seeing that they also have a vote, as are the opinions of the distillers, brewers and saloon keepers. 250,000 Christian voters in Ohio, half of them at least, we know, in the Republican party, several thousand of them in the United Presbyterian church, but the Republican party does not seem to be afraid to offend them lest the prestige of the party be lost in the state. Are we willing to admit that we are less loyal to our convictions and our Lord than the saloon element of Ohio is to its convictions and to its lord? Evidently the Republican party is of this opinion. We shall see next fall.

The canteen stays for fear of offending the liquor interests and arraying them against the Republican party. The Clark local option bill in Ohio is defeated by one vote for fear of offending the liquor interests. Who runs the politics of this country anyhow? It is easy to tell who does not. The 5,000,000 Christian voters are not seriously considered by the party leaders, and the church resolutions are read with the understanding that "Ephraim feedeth on wind."

1,000,000 protests against the canteen at the ballot box in this nation this fall and 100,000 protests against the defeat of the Clark bill in Ohio this fall will do more to convince the Republican party that the church is a living organism than all the resolutions it has ever written.

CHARLOTTE, N. C., April 5, 1900.

AND now we have a camphor trust.

Should We Pay England's Bills.

A recent issue of the Chicago Inter Ocean contains the following very sensible editorial, which should be endorsed by every American:

Gaunt famine stalks through India. Nearly 5,000,000 persons are kept alive by public charity, and the worst is yet to come. American missionaries are calling on this country to save the starving. Lady Curzon, the Chicago wife of the British viceroy, has made a special appeal for aid to her native city. A local committee proposes to raise \$50,000 in Chicago. Similar efforts are making elsewhere. The state of Kansas is relied on for 100 car loads of corn. Other states in the grain belt are expected to make similar contributions. The distress in India is undoubtedly very great. The famine promises to be the worst since British rule began. What is the duty in the premises as Americans?

"England has spent fully \$500,000,000 to subjugate the Boers, and expects to spend at least \$300,000,000 more this year for the same purpose, but she has no millions to spare for India. The English people raise vast sums to care for the widows and orphans of men who have been sacrificed to exterminate republican institutions in South Africa, but their own wards are left to the ravages of famine in Asia. England has plenty of means to pay for shooting freemen and crushing republics, but only a few thousand pounds to save the lives of English subjects in Hindoostan. England is one of the two richest nations on the globe, but she is devoting her wealth to a land-grabbing campaign, and hence Americans are requested to attend to her plain duties for her.

"Suppose we respond to the appeal and come to India's relief. Shall we not, by doing in India what England should do, aid in assuring her the free hand in the Orange Free state and the Transvaal? Shall we not, by assuming England's duty toward India, indirectly help her in the subjugation of the Boer freemen? Is that an object to which any liberty-loving American cares to give his money? Should we help England to husband her resources for the oppression of the Boers by paying her charity bills in India? These are the aspects of the case which seem worthy of serious consideration.

"And we have our own India to look after. There is starvation in Porto Rico—a condition which unwise legislation threatens to make permanent. While there are only thousands in Porto Rico, as against millions in India, yet many of these thousands are dying. The Porto Ricans—our own people, at our doors—would seem as worthy of charitable attention as the distant and alien people of India.

"We have our own Booriboola Gha in Porto Rico. Why neglect our own and seek another in India? Why should we shoulder England's Hindoo burden and aid her to save her strength to exterminate the Boers? Why not let England's responsibility to India remain with England, where it belongs? If England prefers to spend her money in war on the Boers, rather than in the rescue of the starving in India, why should we spend our money to avert the shame of such a choice? Why should we pay any part of England's current bills?"

J. W. LEWIS & SONS

UNDERTAKING

Calls answered day or night. Services of a lady undertaker always furnished when desired. Hearse furnished free. J. W. LEWIS & SONS

5 PER
CENT

Farm Loans

Every
Privilege
To Borrow

We make
Our own Examinations.
No Delays.

Annual or Semi-Annual Interest.
Reasonable Commission.
Privilege to pay all or part.

Slaughter & Taylor, LOAN BROKERS.

Kirk Block. - - Garnett, Kas.

PHOTOS

10 Cents a Dozen

FOR A SHORT TIME ONLY.

COME EARLY AND AVOID THE RUSH.

WALRAD.